

# Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR

#### INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT FILE NO.: GP03-05-03

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** General Plan Amendment to change the General Plan land-use designation from Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 DU/AC) to Public Park/Open Space on 3.2-acres.

Existing Setting: The project site is a portion of a PG&E transmission line easement located between Capitol Park/Bambi Lane and Capitol Expressway. The southerly end of the project site crosses Lower Silver Creek. The Silver Creek right-of-way has been degraded by flood control improvements at this location. Dobern Avenue a local street bisects the subject site. The majority of the site is vacant. Two PG&E transmission towers are exist within the project site and a small wireless communication equipment shelter is located on the southerly end of the easement. A play area approximately 12,500 square feet in size used by the daycare facility and extends into the easterly side of project site. The daycare facility and play area were approved through a Conditional Use Permit (File No. CP 96-010, Montessori Academy).

PROJECT LOCATION Portion of PG&E transmission line easement extending between Capitol Park and

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 DU/AC). **ZONING:** R-1-8 Residence District; CG Commercial General District and A - Agriculture District.

**SURROUNDING LAND USES: North:** Capitol Expressway. **East:** Child day care facility and playground, single-family detached residential. South: Lower Silver Creek and Capitol Park. West: Single-family detached and two-family residential.

PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS: City of San Jose, c/o Bill Scott, 801 North First street, San Jose, CA 95115.

### **DETERMINATION**

### On the basis of this initial study:

$\boxtimes$	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE
	DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a
	significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant
	effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL
	IMPACT REPORT(EIR) is required.
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1)
	adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation
	measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes
	only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?		$\boxtimes$	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			1,3,4
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?		$\boxtimes$	1,3,4

FINDINGS: *No adverse impacts*. The project would facilitate open space and pedestrian trail use of a developed site within an urbanized area. The project will not result in any impacts to farmland or agricultural uses.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

### **III.AIR QUALITY - Would the project:**

				Ü	
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					1,14
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					1,14
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate sensitive or					
FINDINGS: No adverse impacts.  MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.					
modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or				$\boxtimes$	1,10
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				$\boxtimes$	1,6,10
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				$\boxtimes$	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				$\boxtimes$	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			$\boxtimes$		1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation					

FINDINGS: *No adverse impacts*. The project will not conflict with the provisions of any habitat plan. No ordinance size trees or any sensitive natural community is known to exist within PG&E row. Silver Creek has been degraded at this reach. No riparian vegetation is present in proximity to the project site. The southerly end of the project site crosses over Lower Silver Creek and will link future area wide trails network through planned Silver Creek Trail improvements.

Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved

local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

 $\boxtimes$ 

1,2

MITIGATION MEASURES: The project will conform to General Plan Riparian Corridor and Upland Wetlands Policy #4 "New development should be designed to protect adjacent riparian corridors from encroachment of lighting, exotic landscaping, noise and toxic substances into the riparian zone:" and, Urban Design policy #17 which specifies: "Development adjacent to creekside areas should incorporate compatible design and landscaping including plant species which are native to the area or are compatible with native species."

File No. GP03-05-03 INITIAL STUDY				age No.	4	
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources	
The project will conform to Riparian Corridors and Wetlands policy #2 which specifies: "New public and private development adjacent to riparian corridors should be consistent with the provisions of the Riparian Corridor Policy."						
The project will conform to Riparian Corridors and Upland Wetlands Policy #5 which specifies: "When disturbances to riparian corridors and upland wetlands cannot be avoided, appropriate measures should be required to restore, or compensate for damage to the creeks or riparian corridors.						

IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?			1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		$\boxtimes$	1,8

FINDINGS: *No adverse impacts*. The project site is *not* located within an area of known archaeological sensitivity and will not have an adverse impact on known historical or cultural resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The project will conform to Historic, Archaeological and Cultural Policy #9 which specifies: "Recognizing that Native American burials may be encountered at unexpected locations, the City should impose a requirement on all development permits and tentative subdivision maps that upon discovery of such burials during construction, development activity will cease until professional archaeological examination and reburial in a appropriate manner is accomplished.

V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)		$\boxtimes$	1,5,24
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?			1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	$\boxtimes$		1,5,24
4) Landslides?		$\boxtimes$	1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		$\boxtimes$	1,5,24
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			1,5,24
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		$\boxtimes$	1,5,24

Issues  Potentially Significant With Significant Impact  Impact  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Incorporated  No Info. Solution Impact  Impact  Incorporated
---

FINDINGS: *No significant adverse impact*. As is typical for the entire Santa Clara Valley area the project site is located within an area of geological sensitivity. No habitable structures are proposed as part of the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		$\boxtimes$	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			1,2
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		$\boxtimes$	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			1

FINDINGS: No significant adverse impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

	VI. HYDROI	OGY AND	WATER (	OUALITY -	<ul> <li>Would the</li> </ul>	projects
--	------------	---------	---------	-----------	-------------------------------	----------

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		$\boxtimes$	1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?		$\boxtimes$	1
d) Result in increased erosion in its watershed?		$\boxtimes$	1

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?					1
f) Substantially alter drainage patterns due to changes in runoff volumes and flow rates?		$\boxtimes$			
g) Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff as specified in the NPDES permit and the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy?					
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					1,17
i) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters such as heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash?					1,17
j) Result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303 (d) list available from the State Water Control Board?					
k) Result in alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction including clarity, temperature, and level of pollutants?				$\boxtimes$	
1) Substantially alter surface water quality, or marine, fresh, or wetland waters as specified in the NPDES permit?				$\boxtimes$	
m) Substantially alter ground water quality as specified in the NPDES permit?					
n) Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses as specified in the NPDES Permit, General Plan, and City policy?					
o) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				$\boxtimes$	1
p) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					1,9
q) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?					1,9
r) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?					1
s) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					1
FINDINGS: No significant adverse impact. As indicated above	the subject	ct site has is al	ready deve	eloped a	and has bee

FINDINGS: *No significant adverse impact*. As indicated above the subject site has is already developed and has been historically used as PG&E transmission line right-of-way. This amendment would facilitate conversion of this right-of-way with park/trail uses. New development would be constructed to modern environmental and Post Construction Urban Runoff water quality standards.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The project will conform to the City of San Jose's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to reduce impacts on storm water quality from construction and post construction activities.

VII.	LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the pro	oject:			
a) Phys	ically divide an established community?			$\boxtimes$	1,2

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?					1,2
FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts.  MITIGATION MEASURES: The project is consistent with Park City encourages the Santa Clara Valley Water District, school disother public agencies and utilities to provide appropriate recreations. "  MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:	stricts, the	Pacific Gas a	nd Electric	Comp	any and
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				$\boxtimes$	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				$\boxtimes$	1,2,23
FINDINGS: Redevelopment of the project site will not result in MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.  VIII. NOISE - Would the project result in:  a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or	adverse in	mpacts to mine	eral resour	ces.	1,2,13,18
applicable standards of other agencies?  b)Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					1
d)A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				$\boxtimes$	1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					1
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					1

FINDINGS: No significant adverse impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The project will conform the City's General Plan noise guidelines.

# **POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
	T				1
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for				$\boxtimes$	1,2
example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			_		·
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the	П	П	П		1
construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$	1
FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts.					
MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.					
IX. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:  a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the					
provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the					
need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the					
construction of which could cause significant environmental					
impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response					
times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire Protection?				$\boxtimes$	1,2
Police Protection?				$\boxtimes$	1,2
Schools?				$\boxtimes$	1,2
Parks?					1,2
Other Public Facilities?				$\boxtimes$	1,2
FINDINGS: No significant impacts.					
MITIGATION MEASURES: Adequate municipal services are a	vailable to	serve the proj	iect		
X. RECREATION	, carrage to	, serve are proj	,000.		
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and					
regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial				$\boxtimes$	1,2
physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the	_	_	_		
construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have				$\boxtimes$	1,2
an adverse physical effect on the environment?					
FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts.					
MITIGATION MEASURES: "The project is consistent with Tra	ails and Pa	athways policy	#5 which	specifi	es: "The
City should promote cooperative and interagency planning of training of traini		• •		•	
their use for both recreational purposes as well as alternate transp		•			
TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the					
existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a	Ιп		П	$\boxtimes$	1,2,19
substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume					1,2,19
to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?					
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service					1 2 10
standard established by the county congestion management agency					1,2,19
for designated roads or highways?					
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial					1,19
safety risks?					

				Ü	
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?					1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?					1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?					1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?					1,2,18
FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts.  MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.	•••4				
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the pro-	oject:		1	1 1	
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable  Regional Water Quality Control Board?					1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				$\boxtimes$	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				$\boxtimes$	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?					1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to				$\boxtimes$	1,21
accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?					1,21
FINDINGS: <i>No significant adverse impacts</i> .  MITIGATION MEASURES: Adequate municipal services are a	vailable to	serve the pro	ject.	<u>                                     </u>	
XI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE			1	1 1	
a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.					1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				$\boxtimes$	1

Issues	Potentially Significant Significant With Impact Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact Sources
--------	---

FINDINGS: The project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment because the project will conform to the mitigation measures and General Plan Policies as discussed above.

### CHECKLIST REFERENCES

- 1. Environmental Clearance Application File No. GP03-03-008
- 2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
- 3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
- 4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
- 5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
- 6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
- 7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
- 8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
- 9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
- 10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
- 11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
- 12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
- 13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
- 14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
- 15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
- 16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
- 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
- 18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
- 19. San Jose Department of Public Works
- 20. San Jose Fire Department
- 21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
- 22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
- 23. California Division of Mines and Geology
- 24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974